1st February 1929]

APPENDIX VIII.

[Vide answer to question No. 1291 asked by Mr. K. Uppi Sahib at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 1st February 1929, page 546 supra.]

Institution of Second Appeals, Criminal and Civil Appeals in the High Court during the last five years.

—	First Appeals.	O.S. Appeals.	C.C.S. Appeals.	L.P. Appeals.	Second Appeals.	C.M. Appeals.	C.M.S. Appeals.	Referred Trials.	Criminal Appeals.
1924	469	92	41	181	1,462	480	146	103	700
1925	472	132	66	299	1,908	567	172	84	720
1926	373	124	49	428	1,984	471	135	100	700
1927	448	101	60	329	2,469	524	250	94	750
1928	482	143	58	107	1,849	549	197	149	787

Disposal of Second Appeals for the last five years—		Second Appeals ready for hearing during the last three years—	
1924	1,782	on 1st January 1926 ..	1,421
1925	1,575	on 1st January 1927 ..	1,292
1926	1,645	on 1st January 1928 ..	1,495
1927	1,463	on 1st January 1929 ..	1,620
1928	1,193		

APPENDIX IX.

[Vide answer to question No. 1310 asked by Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 1st February 1929, page 555 supra.]

Improvements to the Chennur causeway—Suggestions of Superintending Engineer, Madras Circle.

The failure of the surki concrete as the wearing surface raises a general question whether that material is unsuitable altogether for the wearing surface. Blue metal in surki mortar has stood well elsewhere under similar and even worse conditions of traffic and water action. The failure in the present case is probably due to the use of 'Kankar pebble,' granite slab pavement 4" thick as proposed is therefore approved.

2. When a causeway is laid across a river, there is as a rule, the permanent rising of the bed level above the causeway and in the very design primarily, the inevitable rising of the bed level should have been taken into consideration and the design made. In this case this point was not taken into consideration in the first design and the consequent difficulties must be faced now.